IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DENTSPLY INTERNATIONAL INC. and DENTSPLY RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CORP.,	:	**CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:04-CV-0348**
	:	**(Judge Conner)**
Plaintiffs	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
HU-FRIEDY MFG. CO., INC.,	:	
Defendant	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 5th day of May, 2005, upon consideration of defendant's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 98)[1] of the prior order of court denying summary judgment in its favor, and it appearing that motion merely repeats arguments addressed by the court in the prior decision, see Waye v. First Citizen's Nat'l Bank, 846 F. Supp. 310, 314 (M.D. Pa.) ("A motion for reconsideration is not to be used as a means to reargue matters already argued and disposed of."), aff'd, 31 F.3d 1175 (3d Cir. 1994),[2] it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 98) is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge

[1] The "motion" is, in fact, a legal brief addressing the arguments and authorities in support of the request for reconsideration. Notwithstanding the mistake in nomenclature, the court will construe the document as both a motion for reconsideration and a brief in support thereof. See L.R. 7.1, 7.8.

[2] It may be noted that the essential argument presented in the motion for reconsideration, that the mere existence of a limitation in a patent claim precludes a finding of equivalence, has been twice rejected by the Supreme Court. See Warner-Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chem. Co., 520 U.S. 17, 29, 32-36 (1997); Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co., 339 U.S. 605, 609-10 (1950).